

CITIZEN'S TRANSPORTATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

Arizona Department of Transportation

Draft Minutes November 27, 2007

A Citizen's Transportation Oversight Committee (CTOC) meeting was held at the Chandler Main Library, 2nd Floor Council Chambers, 22 South Delaware Street, Chandler, Arizona 85225 on November 27, 2007 at 4:00 p.m., with Chairman Roc Arnett presiding.

Members Present:

Roc Arnett, Chairman
Terry Rainey, Maricopa County District 1
Jeffrey Schwartz, Maricopa County District 2
Nelson Ladd, Maricopa County District 3
Leyton Woolf, Maricopa County District 4, Conference Call
Peggy Jones, Maricopa County District 5

Members Absent:

Jack Lunsford, Member at Large

Others Present:

Jim Phipps, City of Chandler	Don Jones, Citizen
Dianne Barker, Citizen	Bill Hayden, ADOT
William Crowley, Citizen	Kwi Kang, ADOT
Bill Jameson, A. G. Office	Adrienne Weinkamer, A. G. Office
Larry Langer, ADOT - SEO	Walt Maas, Citizen
Rick Hermann, Citizen	Bob McKnight, Citizen
Elizabeth Neville, ADOT	Doris Anderson, ADOT
Kerry Fehr-Snyder, AZ Republic Newspaper	Mike Mah, City of Chandler
Rick Huemann, Citizen	Mike Normand, City of Chandler

1. Call to Order:

Chairman Roc Arnett Called to Order the Citizen's Transportation Oversight Committee meeting at 4:00 p.m. The Chairman introduced the City of Chandler Public Officials present and welcomed the public, members of CTOC and staff to the meeting. He also thanked the City of Chandler for the use of there excellent facility for the CTOC meeting. It was noted CTOC Board Member Leyton Woolf was participating via telephone conference call.

2. Approval of Minutes:

Chairman Roc Arnett called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes of the September 25, 2007.

Board Action: Leyton Woolf moved to approve the September 25, 2007, minutes and the motion was seconded by Nelson Ladd and carried unanimously.

Dianne Barker stated that on page four, she does not believe she said "there was no sampling with transit," she said that she does not believe in the sampling, she believes in the audit. She asked that the minutes be changed to say "that there was no audit for transit."

Board Action: Leyton Woolf withdrew his original motion and moved to accept the amended minutes as provided by Dianne Barker's comment. The second was amended by Nelson Ladd and carried unanimously.

3. City of Chandler – Status HOV Projects and Light Rail Potential in Chandler:

Mike Normand, Assistant Public Works Director stated that the HOV lanes are in design. This project has been accelerated. As freeways become more crowded and gas prices increase, these features are needed. This will help the express bus service coming on line in the near future. A parking and ride lot is under design. The City of Chandler is in the process of updating the city's general plan and comments heard include interest in the potential to extend Light Rail into the City of Chandler. The City joined Valley Metro Rail to participate in planning for future extensions. The South Tempe Corridor Alignment Study is starting, looking at feasibility. These projects add alternatives to the freeway system.

4. Regional Freeway Status Report:

Bill Hayden gave a graphic presentation on the status of the MAG Regional Freeway Transportation Plan Program. The program summary includes FY 2008-2012. ADOT plans to spend \$3.85 billion over the next five years. In 2008, the \$902.9 million programmed is the highest expenditure the Department and MAG have allocated for freeway construction. Included in the \$3.85 billion are 38 miles of new freeways, 133 miles of lane additions and improvements, 75 miles of new HOV lanes, 34 miles of rubberized asphalt and 6 new traffic interchanges. A graphic of projects was shown and includes HOV lanes and general purpose lanes on I-10 between Sarival Road and Dysart Road beginning in FY 08-09 for \$85 million; general purpose lanes on I-10 from Agua Fria Freeway to I-17 in FY 2010 for \$68 million; a collector distributor road on I-10 between 40th Street and Baseline Road in FY 2010 for \$350 million; HOV lanes and general purpose lanes on I-17 from Jomax Road to SR 74 in FY 2008 for \$95 million; general purpose lane on I-17 from SR 74 to Anthem Way in FY 2009 for \$30.5 million; traffic interchange on I-17 and Dove Valley Road in FY 2008 for \$16.6 million; three construction improvements on US 60; traffic interchange on US 60 Lindsay Road in FY 2012 for \$4.2 million; general purpose lanes on US 60, I-10 to Price Freeway in FY 2010 for \$8 million; general purpose lane on SR 85 from I-8 to I-10 in FY 2008-2010 for \$137 million. On State Route 101, traffic interchanges at Beardsley Road and Union Hills Drive in FY 2012 for \$18 million; HOV lane from Tatum Boulevard to Princess Drive in FY 2008 for \$30 million; HOV lane from Red Mountain Freeway to Baseline Road in FY 2008 for \$17 million and HOV lane from Baseline to Santan in FY 2008 for \$35.5 million. Packaging of programs is being explored. Traffic interchange improvements on SR 143 and SR 202 in FY 2009 for \$32 million will improve access into the airport. Red Mountain Freeway projects include construction of new freeway on SR 202 from 51st Avenue to I-10 West in FY 2009-2011 for \$420 million; general purpose lane on SR 202 from SR 51 to SR 101 in FY 2008 for \$184 million and HOV lane on SR 202 from SR 101 to Gilbert Road in FY 2009 for \$29 million. The South Mountain Freeway has been under study and a draft Environmental Impact Statement is being concluded with anticipation of public hearings next year followed by the request to the Federal Highway Administration to approve the project which is about 26 miles in length. Construction could begin in FY 2009 in the west valley.

Projects on the SR 303 were highlighted and included the TI connecting SR 303 with I-17 at Lone Mountain Road, interim construction on SR 303 from Happy Valley Road to I-17, SR 303 construction of new freeway from I-10 to Grand Avenue and a traffic interchange at SR 303 and I-10 also requiring realignment. Another project in the west valley is along SR 303, a traffic interchange reconstruction by adding an overpass over the future 303 Interchange at Bell Road, Cactus and Waddell Road, utilizing STAN funds with construction beginning in FY 08 for \$20.2 million. During the five-year construction period, the quiet pavement program

and funding of the maintenance will continue. Funds will be programmed for right-of-way acquisitions and improvements on traffic interchanges.

Jeff Schwartz asked after the Federal Highway Administrations approval, what is the next step?

Mr. Hayden said if the draft EIS meets the first approval, the final EIS is sought. The draft EIS goes to the Federal Highway Administration's legal office for a legal sufficiency review. If the review is approved, we are given the direction to go forward with the process that includes a public hearing. All comments received by citizens must be addressed. Those comments and other issues raised are included in the preparation of the final EIS. That document is submitted for final EIS approval. We will then request a record of decision, another comprehensive legal review of the document. We can then proceed with plans to construct the freeway.

Jeff Schwartz asked if there is a consensus on the alignment along the South Mountain portion.

Mr. Hayden stated there is not a consensus on the section of the South Mountain Freeway from 51st Avenue south of Laveen and proceeding east on or parallel with Pecos Road. That has not been approved.

Jeff Schwartz asked if we have right-of-way along that section.

Mr. Hayden said the Department has planned a considerable amount of right-of-way in that section several years ago. We own between 80-85 percent of the right-of-way from 51st Avenue east to I-10. There are issues to be addressed including the proposed alignment potentially could go through South Mountain Park. There are specific rules that preclude construction of freeways from parks that may create a problem.

Nelson Ladd asked if the Indian Reservation out of the question?

Mr. Hayden said no, it is difficult to detect; work is being done to make it feasible to consider. The window of opportunity is being reduced.

Peggy Jones asked what other public meetings are needed?

Mr. Hayden replied that there have been public meetings and there is a federal process that requires specific public hearings in which citizens have the opportunity to voice their opinion. That becomes part of the process and publication of the EIS process.

Jeff Schwartz asked if the Board Members can be sent a copy of this presentation.

Mr. Hayden replied said yes.

5. Call to the Public:

Dianne Barker, Citizen, said that she would like to see this transportation study to look at some fast transit. If they are going to put in a slow trolley, let's take the money and make a fast train. It looks like the state is headed for emissions reduction. We can either accept a federal or the California plan. The Governor apparently wants to cut down on greenhouse gases and they are going to be raising the price of cars by doing re-engineering of the car to get more miles per gallon. Gas is going up. I see there can be movement for good multimodal and transit. On May 12th there is going to be a hearing for PM10. I was looking forward to more involved information about the public process. It was on your September agenda. I did not see it on the amended agenda, however, I did see financial compliance audit on the original agenda for today and that was scratched also so I am interested in that because that is under the law that your duty which I'm sure you well know. The AG's office did extensive changes of the updating of the open meeting law in 2000 and it's not only for the public participation for it's for you too. You can respond to criticism that may come from here. It's very good and I'm going to have a written response for you. Do you agree, Chairman and CTOC members, that the open meeting law completely favors broad community public forum. It protects public officials and the public's body while allowing responding criticism. Under Title 39-431, especially chapter 7, it holds public officials personally responsible for violations. Each violation is \$500. Anybody who aids that person in breaking any of the Open Meetings Law will be responsible too. This is not

only for the attorney general and they represent you so there would be a conflict for them to enforce it but the county attorney can and any citizen can prosecute. I'm putting this in for a response.

Chairman Arnett: Thank you Ms. Barker.

Chairman Arnett: Our next citizen to speak is Walt Maas, Sun City West Resident.

Mr. Maas stated he is one of hundreds affected by the SR 303 noise. We've asked ADOT for mitigation. We've been turned back. We believe their reasons are incomplete and are in error. We look to CTOC for help in this matter. An email summarizing the situation was shared with the Board Members. We would like the Committee to review these issues.

Mr. Hayden commented that following the e-mail sent and directives from the other valley cities on the issue of noise mitigation; we tasked a noise consultant and staff to prepare a comprehensive evaluation of all the areas in metropolitan Phoenix where noise issues have been identified by citizens. A study has been compiled that includes a prioritization of the areas with higher noise levels, a cost feasibility of reducing noise, etc. The report is being reviewed by ADOT staff as well as the MAG staff. A comprehensive report can be given to this Committee and the cities perhaps in January 2008.

Walt Mass continued asking the Committee how they would like him to proceed. What can the citizens expect and when? He said, Mr. Hayden discussed long-range plans but we have an immediate problem.

Bill Jameson, A. G. Office stated that it is not on the agenda today; therefore it cannot be addressed as an agenda item at this time. It can be placed on the January agenda and discussed after the report has been reviewed.

Walt Mass stated that this is less than satisfactory because it is an immediate problem, not a long-range problem.

Chairman Arnett thanked Mr. Maas and called on the next citizen Bob McKnight.

Mr. McKnight shared a copy of a document containing a policy from the National Transportation Library on public involvement. It would be advisable that you read what the federal government is telling you what you are suppose to be doing in relation to public involvement. There is information on safety regarding heavy rail. I am trying to find out what ADOT does for Light Rail. ADOT's position is that Valley Metro Rail is a self-certifying agency and they don't have oversight. I don't think that is right. I think we need somebody to ensure the Corporation Commission upholds public safety. It's in the federal statute that we have an oversight group. A little bit of reading and understanding would help us a great deal.

Chairman Arnett thanked the citizens for their comments.

6. Status of East Valley Pinal County Transportation Studies:

Bill Hayden stated that throughout the valley, the growth continues to exceed projections and the growth has expanded outward. The growth continues in Maricopa and surrounding counties including Pinal County. In the last six years, Pinal County is the sixth fastest growing county in the United States. Maricopa County continues to lead. There are numerous new subdivisions in the area of Queen Creek and east of Gilbert, east of Apache Junction. Issues with this growth include transportation. The current mortgage dilemma has taken a toll and commuting has become problematic due to a lack of freeways. Pinal County officials and CAG have made strong approaches and requests of the Department to consider adding or constructing new freeways or other roadways to connect the far east valley with existing communities including the 202 and Red Mountain Freeway. ADOT responded to inquiries and began to study alternatives to address some of the congestion issues. In 2006, ADOT completed three Corridor Definition Studies to address long-range transportation needs. Three broad corridors are currently being studied, the William Gateway Freeway, US 60 bypass of the Gold Canyon area and a north/south connector from US 60 to the Florence/Coolidge area.

Extensive input and individual meetings were held. Recommendations reflect general planning-level corridors, not exact alignments. Graphics were shared and described. The dilemma is that the residents of Pinal County as well as elected officials would like to see acceleration of construction. The funds are not available to build all of these freeways at this time. Revenues generated from sales tax are not sufficient to build freeways. There is not a specific timeframe for construction.

Nelson Ladd asked if bonding and toll roads being considered?

Mr. Hayden stated that at this time, any options realistic and feasible are being considered. A cost benefit analysis would need to be determined.

7. Next Scheduled Meeting:

Tuesday, January 22, 2008, at 4:00 p.m. in the City of Surprise

8. CTOC Members Reports:

Jeff Schwartz stated that the success of the region will be on every community getting the balance of their funds to ensure there are adequate roadways to handle congestion. As you look forward, forty percent of the growth is in the west valley and it seems that the only way for the region to succeed is to get in front of the growth. I would like to see a presentation on what we are doing to look at the long-range growth of the western areas and what we are doing as far as planning and construction of future highways to ensure we don't get behind.

Bill Jameson, A. G. Office suggested that if this is an item of concern, it could be placed on a future agenda. Proposing agenda items and not discussing items would be appropriate.

Leyton Woolf mentioned that new members were to attend an orientation meeting and asked about the scheduling.

Mr. Jameson in reply, if this is going to be discussed; it is not on the agenda. It can be proposed as an agenda item. It was then suggested that we include the briefing to new members as a discussion in the next meeting agenda.

Nelson Ladd complimented the citizens for their initiative and stated that at the last meeting he asked the chairman if his vote legally counts for all of the Committee or do we have a say in the vote. As a chairman of CTOC, do you have the authority to vote for each of us without consulting us?

Chairman Arnett stated that was a good question and that it will be submitted to legal council for a reply.

Peggy Jones asked for clarification, at the next meeting, is the noise mitigation study going to be included in the agenda and will we be able to discuss Mr. Maas's concerns?

Mr. Hayden replied yes.

9. Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned.